1		
2		Clerk of the Superior Court
3		JAN 2 0 2006
4		BY: L. LIMON
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH COUNTY DIVISION	
12	RIVERWATCH, CITY OF OCEANSIDE, and	 CASE NO. GIN038227
13	PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS	C1151110. C111030227
14	Petitioners and Plaintiffs,	[PROPOSED] PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE
15	V.	
16	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, ACTING AS LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY,	
17	GARY ERBECK, DIRECTOR OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO SOLID WASTE	
18 19	LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY and DOES 1-20	
20	Respondents and Defendants,	
21	GREGORY CANYON LTD. and DOES 21-40,	
22	Real Parties in Interest.	
23		<u> </u>
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	·	
DEDEMOTOD V WOLT OF MANDATE		

Judgment having been entered in this proceeding, ordering that a peremptory writ of mandate be issued from this Court,

IT IS ORDERED that, immediately on service of this writ, Respondents County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health and Gary Erbeck, Director of the County of San Diego Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency shall:

- 1. Set aside the February 6, 2003 decision certifying the final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). This decision is remanded to Respondents for reconsideration.
- 2. Set aside the June 2, 2004 decision making findings in connection with its approval of the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project under CEQA. This decision is remanded to Respondents for reconsideration.
- 3. Set aside the June 2, 2004 decisions approving the solid waste facility permit, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project. These decisions are remanded to Respondents for reconsideration.
- 4. Set aside the October 8, 2004 decisions approving a revised solid waste facility permit and Supplemental Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project. These decisions are remanded to Respondents for reconsideration.

Respondents are further ordered to suspend all activity associated with approval of the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project that could result in any change or alteration to the physical environment until Respondents have reconsidered their decisions and brought those decisions into compliance with the requirements of CEQA and Proposition C.

Having found in Petitioners' favor on the issues raised by Petitioners, except for those matters described in the Court's October 3, 2005 Minute Order, the Court finds that the following action is necessary under Public Resources Code § 21168.9(b) to comply with the provisions of CEQA: those actions necessary to bring the analyses of traffic, water supply and mitigation into compliance with CEQA and Proposition C, pursuant to this Court's Minute Order. In addition, Respondents shall comply with Proposition C by requiring additional mitigation for project

1	impacts, as identified in the Court's Minute Order.		
2	This writ does not mean that Respondents are required to start the EIR process anew.		
3	Rather, Respondents need only correct the deficiencies in the EIR identified above before		
4	considering recertification of the EIR. The form of that correction is a matter for Respondents to		
5	determine in the first instance. Whether the corrections require recirculation of the EIR, in whole		
6	or in part, is for Respondents to decide in the first instance in light of the legal standards		
7	governing recirculation of an EIR prior to certification.		
8	Under Pubic Resources Code § 21168.9(c), this Court does not direct Respondents to		
9	exercise their lawful discretion in any particular way.		
10	This Court will retain jurisdiction over Respondents' proceedings by way of a return to		
11	this peremptory writ of mandate until the Court has determined that Respondents have complied		
12	with the provisions of CEQA and Proposition C.		
13	Respondents must file a return to this writ no later than 60 days from the date this writ is		
14	entered.		
15	Dated: JAN 2 0 2006		
16	JUDGE MICHAEL ANELLO Judge of the Superior Court		
17	Judge of the Superior Court		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		

JAN 2 0 2006

BY: L. LIMON

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, NORTH COUNTY DIVISION

RIVERWATCH, CITY OF OCEANSIDE, and PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

Petitioners and Plaintiffs,

٧.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, ACTING AS LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, GARY ERBECK, DIRECTOR OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO SOLID WASTE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY and DOES 1-20

Respondents and Defendants,

GREGORY CANYON LTD. and DOES 21-40,

Real Parties in Interest.

CASE NO. GIN038227

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT GRANTING PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

The Court took this matter for writ of mandate and declaratory relief on submission on September 9, 2005, following a hearing in Department 29 of this Court, located in Vista, California. Attorneys Everett L. DeLano and Walter Rusinek appeared on behalf of Petitioners RiverWatch and Pala Band of Mission Indians, respectively, and Attorneys Michael H. Zischke and Wesley Peltzer appeared on behalf of Respondents the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health, Gary Erbeck, Director of the County of San Diego Local Enforcement Agency, and the Real Parties in Interest, including Gregory Canyon Ltd..

The Court has reviewed the extensive administrative record, those items for which judicial notice has been taken, the pleadings and written briefs submitted by counsel, and the arguments of counsel at the hearing. This matter having been submitted for decision, and the Court having issued a Minute Order dated October 3, 2005, directing that judgment and a peremptory writ of mandate be issued in this proceeding,

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. Judgment be entered in favor of Petitioners and for declaratory relief that Respondents' approval of the solid waste facility permit for the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill Project violated the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and Proposition C, as identified in the Court's Minute Order.
- 2. A peremptory writ of mandate directed to Respondents issue under seal of this Court ordering Respondents to: (a) set aside their decisions and approvals of the Final Environmental Impact Report, findings, solid waste facility permit, Statement of Overriding Considerations, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, revised solid waste facility permit, and Supplemental Statement of Overriding Considerations for the proposed Gregory Canyon Landfill Project; (b) suspend all activity associated with approval of the Gregory Canyon Landfill Project that could result in any change or alteration to the physical environment until Respondents have reconsidered their decisions and brought those decisions into compliance with the requirements of CEQA and Proposition C; (c) comply with the provisions of CEQA by performing those actions necessary to bring the analyses of traffic, water supply and mitigation into compliance with CEQA and Proposition C, and in a manner consistent with the Court's

Minute Order; and (d) comply with Proposition C by requiring additional mitigation for project 1 2 impacts, as identified in the Court's Minute Order. This writ does not mean that Respondents are required to start the EIR process anew. 3 Rather, Respondents need only correct the deficiencies in the EIR identified above before 4 considering recertification of the EIR. The form of that correction is a matter for Respondents to 5 determine in the first instance. Whether the corrections require recirculation of the EIR, in whole 6 or in part, is for Respondents to decide in the first instance in light of the legal standards 7 8 governing recirculation of an EIR prior to certification. 9 Petitioners are awarded their costs of suit and attorneys' fees. 3. This Court shall retain jurisdiction to determine Petitioners' entitlement to any 10 4. such costs and fees and over Respondents' return of the writ. 11 12 JAN 2 0 2006 MICHAEL M. ANELLO Dated: 13 JUDGE MICHAEL ANELLO Judge of the Superior Court 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28